



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/902,924	07/10/2001	Kreisler Lau	30-4907 DIV (4780)	1232

7590 01/06/2003

SANDRA P. THOMPSON  
RUTAN & TUCKER, LLP  
611 ANTON BOULEVARD, FOURTEENTH FLOOR  
COSTA MESA, CA 92626-1998

EXAMINER

MULLIS, JEFFREY C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	/0
1711		

DATE MAILED: 01/06/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

53

<b>Offic Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/902,924	LAU ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jeffrey C. Mullis	1711

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM  
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 September 2002.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disp sition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 19-37 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) 19-21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 22-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
  - a)  The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>4.6</u> .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

Art Unit 1711

Applicants' preliminary amendment A of 8-20-01 to the specification has not been entered since no clean copy of the paragraph being amended and marked up copy has been submitted showing the exact place at which the changes have been made.

The specification is objected to since Figures 3C, 3D and 4C do not exist despite the fact that they are described.

Correction is required. Furthermore page 4 recites "Brief Description of The Drawing" despite the fact that there are plural drawings, not a single drawing as implied by the word "Drawing". Correction is required.

Claims 25, 26, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

The "aromatic portion" recited in dependent claims 25, 30 and 33 and possibly others lacks antecedent basis in any preceding claim.

The non-statutory double patenting rejection, whether of the obviousness-type or non-obviousness-type, is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent. *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); and *In re Goodman*, 29 USPQ 2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(b) and (c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a non-statutory double patenting

Art Unit 1711

ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.78(d).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 22-37 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3-10 and 12-28 of copending application Serial No. 09/545,058. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because choice of the particular species of the claims of the instant application from those of the allowed application '058 would have been obvious to a practitioner having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention since all species are expected to work and in the expectation of adequate results absent any showing of surprising or unexpected results.

This is a *provisional* obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

The Examiner realizes that the present case is indicated as a divisional by applicants. However the instant claims appear to be drawn to the same invention as the allowed claims and therefore do not appear to have been filed as a result of the restriction requirement.

Serial No. 09/902,924

-4-

Art Unit 1711

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Jeffrey Mullis at telephone number (703) 308-2820.

J. Mullis:cdc

December 31, 2002

Jeffrey Mullis  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1711

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jeffrey Mullis". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large, stylized 'J' on the left and a more vertical, looped section on the right.